

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

William A. Brown, #208706

Petitioner,

v.

Stan Burtt, Warden, Lieber Correctional  
Institution; Henry McMaster, Attorney  
General for South Carolina; and  
the United States of America,

Respondents.

---

C/A No. 9:07-cv-00317-GRA-GCK

**ORDER**  
(Written Opinion)

This matter is before the Court for a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2)(c), D.S.C. Petitioner filed this action on February 1, 2007, seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The magistrate judge issued his Report and Recommendation on February 13, 2007, and recommended that this petition be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process of the respondents. For the following reasons, the Court accepts the recommendation of the magistrate.

Petitioner is proceeding *pro se*. This Court is required to construe *pro se* pleadings liberally. Such pleadings are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978). This

Court is charged with liberally construing a pleading filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow for the development of a potentially meritorious claim. *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972).

The magistrate makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). This Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and this Court may "accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). This Court may also "receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the magistrate with instructions." *Id.*

In order for objections to be considered by a United States District Judge, the objections must be timely and must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which the party objects and the basis for the objections. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 n.4 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-47 nn.1-3 (4th Cir. 1985). "Courts have . . . held *de novo* review to be unnecessary in . . . situations when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendation." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Furthermore, in the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation, this Court is not required to give any explanation for


adopting the recommendation. *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198 (4th. Cir. 1983).

Petitioner has not filed any objections in this case.

After a review of the magistrate's Report and Recommendation, this Court finds the report is based upon the proper law. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is accepted and adopted in its entirety.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that this case be DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



G. ROSS ANDERSON, JR.  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

March 6, 2007

Anderson, South Carolina

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

\_\_\_\_\_Petitioner has the right to appeal this Order within sixty (60) days from the date of the entry of this Order, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. Failure to meet this deadline, as modified by Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, will waive the right to appeal.